

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/200,523	11/25/1998	SYED AON MUJTABA	4927		
7590 06/02/2005			EXAMINER		
JOSEPH B RYAN RYAN & MASON & LEWIS, LLP			ELALLAM, AHMED		
90 FOREST AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560			2662		

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)	(K
			23	MUJTABA, SYED	AON
	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit	
			ELALLAM	2662	
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communion Reply	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the o	correspondence ac	ldress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI ensions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common of the provision of t	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no enunication. O) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and wwill, by statute, cause the ap	vent, however, may a reply be tir tutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on 24 November 2	2004.		
2a)□		2b)⊠ This action is i			
3)	Since this application is in condition	· •		osecution as to the	e merits is
,—	closed in accordance with the practic				
Disposit	ion of Claims			•	
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-10,12-17 and 19-21</u> is	s/are pending in the	application.		
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ai		• •		
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
· —	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-10,12-17 and 19-21</u> is	s/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or election	requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers				•
9)	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		OD objected to by the	Examiner	
,	Applicant may not request that any object		•		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including				FR 1 121(d)
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	•	• • •		` '
		- 5, 11.16 <u>- 1</u> .11.11.11			102.
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim to All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority	,)-(d) or (f).	
	2. Certified copies of the priority	documents have bee	en received in Applicati	on No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of			ed in this National	Stage
* *	application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action	` · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·	\d	
`	see the attached detailed Office action	i ioi a list of the cert	med copies not receive	:u.	,
		•			
Attachmen	` '				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	TO 040)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413)	
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pomation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or I		5) Notice of Informal P		D-152)
	r No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	, ,	,

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment filed on 11/24/2004.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17 and 19-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alamouti et al, US (5,933,421) in view of Sjoberg et al, (Performance evaluation of the Zipper duplex method), IEEE 1998, pages 1035-1039 and further in view of Nakagawa et al, US (56,256,508).

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 15, with reference to figure 1, Alamouti discloses a wireless cellular communication system in which a plurality of remote stations (U, V) communicate with a base station Z, the base station receiving a first incoming wireless signal comprising a plurality of first discrete frequency tones that are orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) in a first frequency band from a first remote station (U), and a second incoming wireless signal comprising a plurality of second

Art Unit: 2662

discrete frequency tones that are orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) in a the first frequency band from a second remote station (V), and that the first and second remote stations have different sets of discrete frequency tones. See column 5, lines 21-67. In addition, Alamouti discloses that the base station transmit a first wireless outgoing signal 18 comprising a plurality of third discrete frequency tones FI that are orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) in a second frequency band to the first remote station (U), and that the first remote station and base station use different sets of discrete frequency tones (F2, F!), see column 9, lines 66-67 and column 10, lines 1-13. Alamouti further discloses that the total signal frequency band is divided into N frequency orthogonal sub-channels, see column 3, lines 7-24, and that the total bandwidth of the airlink (uplink and downlink) is divided into a lower band and upper band. See column 13, lines 9-20.

Alamouti does not disclose assigning to one of uplink and down link a k carriers in a set of M OFDM carriers in a given frequency band, and assigning to the other of the uplink and down link the remaining M-k carriers in the set of M carriers, wherein adaptive duplexing between uplink and down link is achievable by varying the value of k.

However, Sjoberg discloses a Zipper Duplex in which different DMT sub-carriers (Discrete Multi-tone carriers are allocated dynamically for the upstream and downstream, and that the number of upstream sub-carrier and the number of downstream sub-carriers are complimentary to each other (claimed k and M-k sub-

Application/Control Number: 09/200,523

Art Unit: 2662

carriers), the Zipper transmits and receives simultaneously. See pages 1035-1036,

paragraphe II.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the OFDM allocation of Alamouti with the teaching of dynamic upstream and downstream DMT-subcarrier allocation of Sjoberg so that adaptive bandwidth allocation can be provided.

Alamouti in view Sjoberg do not disclose that communications between the base station and a subset of the plurality of subscribers units are separated from one another using one or more sector-specific spreading codes, wherein the sector-specific codes being associated with a corresponding sector of an antenna of the base station.

However, Nakagawa discloses separating communications between users and a broadcast station using sector-specific spreading codes, each associated with a corresponding sector of an antenna of the broadcast station (base station), see figure 9, column 9, lines 65-69, and column 10, lines 1-14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the sectorizing method taught by Nakagawa in the system of Alamouti in view of Sjoberg by recognizing the advantage in interference reduction from the teaching of Nakagawa. (Nakagawa, column 11, lines 30-40). The advantage of implementing Nakagawa's sectorizing in the system of Alamouti in view of Sjoberg would be the ability of the base station to simultaneously broadcast sector-specific data with minimum interference.

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16, Alamouti discloses that the wireless unit can be fixed. See column 8, lines 20-28.

Page 5

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17, Alamouti discloses that the first and second wireless signals from the remote units (U, V) to the base station Z, and the third wireless signal form the base station Z to the first remote unit (U) are transmitted in different TDMA intervals, see column 9, lines 19-67, and column 10, lines 1-13. (Corresponding to using Time Division Multiple Access for separating communication between a subset of the subscriber units).

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 20, with reference to figure 1.7, Alamouti discloses an inverse Fourier transform operation at the base station.

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 21, with reference to figure 1.10, Alamouti discloses a Fourier transform operation at base station receiver system to recover multiplexed orthogonal frequency division multiplexed carrier.

2. Claims 5, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alamouti in view of Sjoberg and further in view of Nakagawa as applied to respective claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Frodigh et al. US (5,726,978).

Regarding claims 5, 12, 19, Alamouti in view of Sjoberg and further of Nakagawa discloses substantially all the limitations of parent claims 1, 8 and 15, except it doesn't explicitly disclose that the number of carriers in uplink and downlink sets varies across the time slots in accordance with uplink and down link demand.

However, Frodigh, with reference to figures 2 and 7, discloses an adaptive channel allocation method in an OFDMA system in which each up/down link capacities between a mobile and a base station are allocated based on bandwidth requests. See column 7, lines 39-50 and column 13, lines 23-46.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Frodigh's adaptive channel allocation (OFDM allocations) with the OFDMA/timeslots allocation of Alamouti in view of Sjoberg and further in view of Nakagawa so to increase the capacity of the system.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, and 15 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AHMED ELALLAM whose telephone number is (571) 272-3097. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kizou Hassan can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2662

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AHMED ELALLAM Examiner Art Unit 2662 Tuesday, May 24, 2005

> JOHN PEZZLO PRIMARY EXAMINER